



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/079,860 | 02/22/2002 | Kenji Ishikawa | 60188-154 | 7538 |

7590 06/29/2006

Jack Q. Lever, Jr.
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

TOPGYAL, GELEK W

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2621

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/079,860

Applicant(s)

ISHIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Gelek Topgyal

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. **Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanade et al. (US 7,027,083).

Regarding claim 1, Kanade et al. discloses a recording system comprising a plurality of video camera devices (Fig. 2, elements 14, 16), wherein said plurality of video camera devices include:

a parent device having a signal sending/receiving function and a control function for said recording system (See Fig. 2, and col. 4, lines 28-47 teaches of a master control unit 24 of the master camera system 14 being capable of communicating via a network 28 to send and receive functions);

and at least one child device having a signal sending/receiving function (See Fig. 2, element 16 which shows numerous slave camera systems),

said parent device sends synchronization data for time synchronization (Col. 6, lines 5-33, teaches that the cameras are synchronized by a genlock signal),

and said child device receives said synchronization data sent from said parent device and performs a shooting operation in time synchronization with said parent device in accordance with said synchronization data (Col. 6, lines 5-33, teaches that the cameras are synchronized by a genlock signal, when the master camera system 14 trigger is pressed, the genlock signal causes all the shutters on the slave cameras 16 to fire at the same time).

Regarding claim 3, Kanade et al. discloses the claimed wherein said parent device sends, as control information, an operation parameter for defining operation specification of said child device, and said child device receives said operation parameter sent from said parent device and performs the shooting operation with said operation specification thereof set in accordance with said operation parameter (Col. 4, line 48 – col. 5, line 42 teaches that operation parameters in the form of Pan, Tilt, Zoom and Focus are encoded by the master control unit 24, and are sent to the slave camera systems 16 to control the Pan, Tilt, Zoom and Focus operation parameters of the slave cameras).

Claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as disclosed in claim 3 above.

Regarding claim 5, Kanade et al. discloses all the limitations in claim 3 above, and furthermore the master control unit 24 continuously sends the PTZF parameters to

the slave cameras. The continuous sending of PTZF parameters of the system to control the slave cameras meets the limitation of changing the operation specification of the child device.

Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claims 1 and 3 above.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claims 1 and 3 above.

Method claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in system claim 1, above.

Method claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as discussing in system claims 1 and 3, above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 2, 7, 10 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanade et al. (US 7,027,083) in view of Zhang et al. (6, 864,911).

Regarding claim 2, Kanade et al. discloses all the limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, but fails to disclose wherein said parent device has a function to store video received from said child device as well as video data taken by said parent device.

In an analogous art, Zhang et al. discloses a linkable camera system wherein after video data is taken in a linked camera system, the slave camera transfers the

video data taken by the slave camera to the master camera, and as a result the master camera stores both the video data from the master and the slave camera (See col. 10, lines 8-16).

Kanade et al. in col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 29 discloses a need for a video reviewer to put together a sequence of videos captured from the plurality of cameras in the system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the ability for a parent device to receive and store the video data sent from a child device into the system of Kanade et al. to allow a user with the capability to access all the video data captured by the plurality of camera devices at a determined location to facilitate a user (an editor) to use the multiple video data for faster and improved sequencing or editing of video data. The limitation negates the inefficient and lengthy period for video production of having to wait for tapes from multiple cameras to put together a sequenced video program.

Claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claims 1 and 2, above.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claims 1 and 2, above.

Method claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in system claims 1 and 2, above.

5. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanade et al. (US 7,027,083) in view of Takashi (JP 2000-102073).

Regarding claim 6, Kanade et al. teaches all the limitations as discussed in claim 1, above, but fails to particularly teach wherein said child device includes: a signal intensity detecting unit for detecting intensity of a receive signal and outputting an identification signal corresponding to whether or not the intensity of the receive signal is lowered; and a memory unit for receiving said identification signal and, when said identification signal corresponds to lowering of the intensity of the receive signal, for temporarily storing video data to be sent, and when the intensity of the receive signal is restored, said video data stored in said memory unit is sent.

In analogous art, Takashi teaches a system wherein an operating system 10 controls a system wherein when a radio link with between stations becomes weak; the outgoing data is stored in memory unit 20b (Abstract and paragraph 25). The memory unit 20b then subsequently sends the outgoing data to another memory unit 20a when the capacity becomes low (Abstract and paragraph 26). Then when the radio link is strong enough for transmission, the system starts to transmit the outgoing data from the buffers 20b and 20a (Abstract and paragraph 29-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the ability to detect the signal intensity of the radio link and to temporarily store the data until the signal strength gets stronger as taught by Takashi into the system of Kanade et al. so that important transmitted data is not lost due to poor signal quality or failing radio links.

Takashi expresses the need to detect the strength of the radio link and to buffer outgoing data so that data is not lost and abandoned in paragraphs 4-10.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


The cited references teach multiple camera systems that can be synchronized.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gelek Topgyal whose telephone number is 571-272-8891. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am -5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gelek Topgyal
6/23/2006



THAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER